

Author	Year	Country	Sample Size	Age Range	Gender	Study Type	Findings
Smith et al.	2001	USA	150	18-25	Male	Experimental	High levels of aggression in response to provocation.
Johnson et al.	2003	UK	200	16-30	Male	Survey	Aggression levels decreased with age.
Lee et al.	2005	China	120	17-28	Male	Experimental	Aggression increased with alcohol consumption.
Wang et al.	2007	China	180	18-30	Male	Survey	Aggression levels were higher in urban areas.
Chen et al.	2009	China	220	17-30	Male	Experimental	Aggression levels were higher in response to negative feedback.
Li et al.	2011	China	160	18-28	Male	Survey	Aggression levels were higher in response to social exclusion.
Zhang et al.	2013	China	240	17-30	Male	Experimental	Aggression levels were higher in response to negative feedback.
Qin et al.	2015	China	190	18-28	Male	Survey	Aggression levels were higher in response to negative feedback.
Wu et al.	2017	China	210	17-30	Male	Experimental	Aggression levels were higher in response to negative feedback.
Yang et al.	2019	China	230	18-28	Male	Survey	Aggression levels were higher in response to negative feedback.
Xu et al.	2021	China	250	17-30	Male	Experimental	Aggression levels were higher in response to negative feedback.
Chen et al.	2022	China	260	18-28	Male	Survey	Aggression levels were higher in response to negative feedback.
Li et al.	2023	China	270	17-30	Male	Experimental	Aggression levels were higher in response to negative feedback.
Wang et al.	2024	China	280	18-28	Male	Survey	Aggression levels were higher in response to negative feedback.
Zhang et al.	2025	China	290	17-30	Male	Experimental	Aggression levels were higher in response to negative feedback.

I further declare that all statements made herein on my own knowledge are true and all statements made on information and belief are believed to be true; and further that these statements were made with the knowledge that willful false statements and the like so made are punishable by fine or imprisonment, or both, under Section 1001 of Title 18 of the United States Code, and that such willful false

statements may jeopardize the validity of the application or any patent issuing thereon.

SIGNATURE OF INVENTORS

Eugen I. Cabuz
Eugen I Cabuz

DATE: 01.23.2002

37 C.F.R. §1.56

(a) A patent by its very nature is affected with a public interest. The public interest is best served, and the most effective patent examination occurs when, at the time an application is being examined, the Office is aware of and evaluates the teachings of all information material to patentability. Each individual associated with the filing and prosecution of a patent application has a duty of candor and good faith in dealing with the Office, which includes a duty to disclose to the Office all information known to that individual to be material to patentability as defined in this section. The duty to disclose information exists with respect to each pending claim until the claim is canceled or withdrawn from consideration, or the application becomes abandoned. Information material to the patentability of a claim that is canceled or withdrawn from consideration need not be submitted if the information is not material to the patentability of any claim remaining under consideration in the application. There is no duty to disclose all information which is not material to the patentability of any existing claim. The duty to disclose all information known to be material to patentability is deemed to be satisfied if all information known to be material to patentability of any claim issued in a patent was cited by the Office or submitted to the Office in the manner prescribed by §§ 1.97(b)-(d) and 1.98. However, no patent will be granted on an application in connection with which fraud on the Office was practiced or attempted or the duty of disclosure was violated through bad faith or intentional misconduct. The Office encourages applicants to carefully examine:

- (1) prior art cited in search reports of a foreign patent office in a counterpart application, and
 - (2) the closest information over which individuals associated with the filing or prosecution of a patent application believe any pending claim patentably defines, to make sure that any material information contained therein is disclosed to the Office.
- (b) Under this section, information is material to patentability when it is not cumulative to information already of record or being made of record in the application, and
- (1) It establishes, by itself or in combination with other information, a prima facie case of unpatentability of a claim, or
 - (2) It refutes, or is inconsistent with a position the applicant takes in:
 - (i) Opposing an argument of unpatentability relied on by the Office, or
 - (ii) Asserting an argument of patentability.

A prima facie case of unpatentability is established when the information compels a conclusion that a claim is unpatentable under the preponderance of evidence, burden-of-proof standard, giving each term in the claim its broadest reasonable construction consistent with the specification, and before and consideration is given to evidence which may be submitted in an attempt to establish a contrary conclusion of patentability.

(c) Individuals associated with the filing or prosecution of a patent application within the meaning of this section are:

(1) Each inventor named in the application;

(2) Each attorney or agent who prepares or prosecutes the application; and

(3) Every other person who is substantively involved in the preparation or prosecution of the application and who is associated with the inventor, with the assignee or with anyone to whom there is an obligation to assign the application.

(d) Individuals other than the attorney, agent or inventor may comply with this section by disclosing information to the attorney, agent or inventor.

005703-042400